

Pursuant to Ind.Appellate Rule 65(D), this Memorandum Decision shall not be regarded as precedent or cited before any court except for the purpose of establishing the defense of res judicata, collateral estoppel, or the law of the case.

APPELLANT PRO SE:

**TED A. CZANDERNA**  
Terre Haute, Indiana

---

**IN THE  
COURT OF APPEALS OF INDIANA**

---

TED A. CZANDERNA,	)	
	)	
Appellant,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	No. 84A01-0609-CV-410
	)	
NOREEN F. FEAR,	)	
	)	
Appellee.	)	

---

APPEAL FROM THE VIGO SUPERIOR COURT  
The Honorable Christopher A. Newton, Judge  
Cause No. 84D04-0608-PO-06131

---

**May 30, 2007**

**MEMORANDUM DECISION - NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

**RILEY, Judge**

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellant-Respondent, Ted A. Czanderna (Czanderna), appeals the trial court's protective order enjoining him from contact with Appellee-Petitioner, Noreen Faye Fear (Fear), and members of Fear's family, for a period of two years.

We affirm.

## ISSUE

Czanderna raises three issues on appeal, which we consolidate and restate as the following single issue: Whether the trial court erred in issuing a Protective Order prohibiting him from contacting Fear and members of Fear's family.

## FACTS AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On September 15, 2006, the trial court entered the following Findings and Order:

## ORDER FOR PROTECTION

## FINDINGS

This matter having been heard by the [c]ourt on September 15, 2006 pursuant to Ind. Code § 34-26-5-10, the [c]ourt now makes the following Findings []:

- a. [Fear] filed a timely Request for Hearing pursuant to [I.C. § 34-26-5-10(a)]; and/or
- b. The [c]ourt is required to hold a hearing pursuant to [I.C. § 34-26-5-10(b)].
- c. [Fear] was present at the hearing and [Czanderna] was present. Witnesses are sworn, evidence is heard.
- d. [Czanderna] had notice and an opportunity to be heard.

- e. [Fear] has shown, by a preponderance of the evidence, that domestic or family violence has occurred sufficient to justify the issuance of this Order.
- f. [Czanderna] has failed to show good cause why this Order for Protection should not be issued.
- g. [Czanderna] does agree to the issuance of the Order for Protection.
- h. [Czanderna] represents a credible threat to the safety of [Fear] or a member of [Fear's] household.
- i. The following relief is necessary to bring about a cessation of the violence or the threat of violence.

### ORDER

\* \* \*

1. [Czanderna] is hereby enjoined from threatening to commit or committing acts of domestic or family violence against [Fear] and the following designated family or household members, if any: Everett Fear and Faith Fear.
2. [Czanderna] is prohibited from harassing, annoying, telephoning, contacting, or directly or indirectly communicating with [Fear].
3. [Czanderna] is ordered to stay away from the residence, school, and/or place of employment of [Fear]. [Czanderna] is further ordered to stay away from the following place(s) that is/are frequented by [Fear and/or Fear's family or household members]:

Otter Creek Middle School . . . Terre Haute, [Indiana (Faith Fear's school)].

4. [Czanderna] is prohibited from using or possessing a firearm, ammunition, or deadly weapon.

(Appellant's Br. pp. 11-13).

Czanderna now appeals. Additional facts will be provided if we can ascertain them.

## DISCUSSION AND DECISION

In this appeal, Czanderna asks this court to vacate the Protective Order (Order) prohibiting him from contact with Fear and Fear's family members. Specifically, Czanderna contends the trial court improperly issued the Order because: (1) the Order is based, in part, on a police report which contains hearsay; (2) he was not represented by legal counsel, and thus was denied fair access to the legal system; and (3) Fear did not show by a preponderance of the evidence that Czanderna posed any harm to her or her family members.

While, initially, Czanderna's recitation of the issues appear to have a legal basis, we find that the remaining portion of his Brief contains no legal support whatsoever for these arguments.<sup>1</sup> Rather, in lieu of a legal analysis, Czanderna supplies us with a lengthy and incoherent explanation of the personal problems in his life.<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, such personal circumstances do not give us any legal justification for either reviewing or vacating the trial court's Order. Consequently, Czanderna has waived consideration of the issues he presents on appeal for failure to support his contentions with cogent reasoning or citation to relevant authority. *See* Ind. App. R. 46(A)(8).

---

<sup>1</sup> In addition, we note that Czanderna did not include a copy of the transcript from the trial court's hearing on Fear's Petition for a protective order. The absence of a transcript, combined with Czanderna's Brief -- which is void of all logic and any legal reasoning -- leaves us entirely unable to analyze the issues he attempts to present for our review.

<sup>2</sup> For example, Czanderna complains of his own disabilities and health issues, as well as his Mother's suffering from Parkinson's Disease, his father's bad temper while growing up, his younger brother's bad temper, and his sister's death from cancer at a young age.

### CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, we conclude that the trial court properly issued a Protective Order preventing Czanderna from having contact with Fear or Fear's family members.

Affirmed.

BARNES, J., and NAJAM, J., concur.